

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated February 9, 2005. Claims 1, 14-18 and 52 are pending the patent application. Claims 1, 14 and 52 have been amended. Claims 61-63 are new. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments made herein. Claims 1, 14-18 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are improper at least for the reasons set forth below.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 14-18 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,209 issued to Laval et al. ("Laval"). Applicants believe that Laval, on its own, is distinguishable from the claimed invention as defined by claims 1, 14-18 and 52. Of the pending claims at issue, claims 1, 14 and 52 are the sole independent claims.

Independent claim 1 recites an electronic ticket management system that includes an event organizer apparatus for generating event information; an electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus for distributing electronic ticket information that authenticates a right to attend the event, said electronic information further including a plurality of attendee information; an information storage chip for storing the electronic ticket information; and an electronic ticket platform center for managing the distribution of the electronic ticket information. The event organizer apparatus registers the generated event information in the electronic ticket platform center. Further, the electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus authenticates whether the electronic ticket information is to be distributed to a user of the information storage chip be receiving a request for distribution of the electronic ticket information from the user, and registers an authentication result in the electronic ticket platform center as ticket issuing information. Additionally, the electronic ticket platform center generates an electronic ticket information master based on the event information registered by the event organizer apparatus, and performs ticket issuing processing for writing the electronic ticket information into the information storage chip based on the ticket issuing information, said ticket issuing information being registered in the electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus based on the generated ticket information master.

Independent claim 14 recites a method for electronic ticket distribution authentication that includes generating event information at an event organizer apparatus; registering generated

event information in an electronic ticket platform center; receiving a request, at an electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus, to distribute electronic ticket information concerning events from a user of an information storage chip, said electronic ticket information further including a plurality of attendee information; performing distribution authentication processing for determining whether the registered electronic ticket information is to be distributed to the requesting user; registering an authentication result in the electronic ticket platform center for managing the distribution of the electronic ticket information as ticket issuing information; generating an electronic ticket information master and performs ticket issuing processing for writing electronic ticket information into the information storage chip based on the ticket issuing information, said ticket issuing information being registered in the electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus based on the generated ticket information master.

Independent claim 52 includes an electronic ticket management system using an information storage chip for storing electronic ticket information which authenticates a right to attend a specific event, the electronic ticket management system that includes an electronic ticket information forming unit for forming event information unique to each event, and for generating electronic ticket information in correspondence with event information, said electronic ticket information forming unit further generating an electronic ticket information master based on the event information; an electronic ticket information writer for writing the electronic ticket information into the information storage chip, said electronic ticket information further including a plurality of attendee information; and an electronic ticket information reader installed at an event venue corresponding to the event information, wherein said ticket information reader performs distribution authentication processing for determining whether the electronic ticket information is to be distributed to a user of the information storage chip based on the generated electronic ticket information master, and registers an authentication result in the electronic ticket information writer as ticket issuing information.

Applicants believe that Laval fails to disclose or suggest at least a number of features of the claimed invention. For example, Applicants believe that Laval at least fails to disclose that the electronic ticket information includes a plurality of attendee information. In fact, Laval teaches away from electronic ticket information further including a plurality of attendee information. The customer information in Laval only contains ticket information relating to the

customer's purchased ticket. Col. 15, ln. 4-9; Col. 16, ln. 14-19. Clearly, the customer information provided in Laval, does not provide for a plurality of customers information on the ticket. Further, Laval discloses that while a customer may be entitled to obtain one or more passes to one or more attractions, a customer is not entitled to obtain multiple passes for a single attraction. Col. 6, ln. 56-64. On the contrary, the electronic ticket information in the present claims, may allow a purchaser to obtain multiple tickets to the same attraction. For example, there may not be a one-to-one correspondence between the ticket purchaser and the attendee. See, Specification, for example, pg. 21, ln. 7-19. Thus, one person may purchase a plurality of tickets at the same time, or may purchase tickets for others.

Clearly, the ticket in Laval is meant to reserve a single place in a virtual line for a single customer. However, the electronic ticket information in the present claims allows a user to reserve multiple positions.

Therefore, Laval on its own is clearly deficient with respect to the claimed invention. Based on at least these reasons, Applicant believes that Laval is distinguishable from the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the anticipation rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 14-18 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,502,806 to Mahoney et al. ("Mahoney") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,227 to Goldstein et al. ("Goldstein"). Thus, the Patent Office primarily relies on Mahoney and further relies on the Goldstein reference to remedy the deficiencies of same. Applicants believe that this rejection is improper and further the combination of Mahoney and Goldstein is distinguishable from the claimed invention as defined by claims 1, 14-18 and 52.

As discussed above, the claimed invention discloses that the electronic ticket information includes a plurality of attendee information. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest same. Mahoney is directed to a waiting line management system that provides patrons with a card or electronic identification device that allows the patron to select a time slot to access a service. Utilizing the card, the user can later return and access the service according to the pre-selected time slot. The waiting line management system is meant to be implemented in any setting where the usage demands exceeds the capacity for any service which results in a waiting period in a queue for human patrons. See, Abstract. Clearly, the card

in Mahoney is meant to substitute for a patron's position in a queue, such that the patron does not need to physically remain in the queue until they are able to access the service. Further, the card is required to be read by a line entry reader in order for the patron to gain access to a queue for the service. See, col. 4, ln. 33-47. Clearly, this means that for each patron not wanting to wait in a typical queue for a service, the individual patron may utilize the card. The card provides each patron with a time slot such that the patron can return during the provided time slot. The patron utilizes the card to gain access to the service. Nowhere in Mahoney is it provided that the card can provide time slots for a plurality of patrons, or that the card can provide access to the queue for a plurality of patrons.

Goldstein fails to remedy this. Goldstein is directed to a system and method for storing and validating electronic tickets for multiple venues on a single smart card. See, Abstract. Goldstein discloses that the electronic ticket may include a venue applet that is accessible by an individual venue. Goldstein further discloses a shared ticketing applet that is for use by all venues. Goldstein additionally discloses that the electronic ticket may contain ticketing information for multiple events. However, Goldstein fails to provide that the electronic ticket can include information for a plurality of users. In fact, the electronic ticket in Goldstein teaches away from providing for a plurality of users. For example, an electronic ticket according to Goldstein can be inserted into could be inserted into a smart card reader located within a seating area at an event to verify that a user is in his or her ticketed seat or to help him or her find the correct seat. See, col. 4, ln. 47-51. Clearly, this further suggests that the electronic ticket in Goldstein is provided for an individual user, and not for a plurality of users. In another example, the electronic ticket in Goldstein is owned by an individual. Clearly, this further suggests that the electronic ticket in Goldstein does not provide for including a plurality of attendee information.

Based on at least these reasons, alone or in combination, Mahoney and/or Goldstein fail to disclose or suggest the claimed invention and thus fail to render the claimed invention obvious.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 1, 14-18 and 52 be withdrawn.

Applicants have also added new claims 61-63 as fully supported in the specification, for example, on pg. 9 at ln. 8-14. Applicants believe that claims 61-63 are patentable over Laval and Mahoney, alone or in combination with Goldstein, at least for substantially the same reasons as described above.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4310

Dated: March 29, 2005